

The Upper Canada College Question.

MR. HUNTER'S REPLY TO A RECENT ARTICLE IN THE TORONTO TELEGRAPH.

To the Editor of the Telegraph,

Sir,—You have thought fit to give insertion in the *Telegraph* of the 3rd November to a quasi editorial containing a most malicious and a most dastardly attack upon the author of the Upper Canada College Pamphlet. As you have, in your generosity, furnished to your quasi editor at least the assassin's mantle, if not the assassin's dagger, I trust that you will, in justice to the author of the assailed Pamphlet, afford him an opportunity of defence.

The writer of this article to which I have alluded, and who, in more than one sense represents Upper Canada College, sets out with a wilful falsification of my Pamphlet. In that document, (p. 25), I had, while illustrating the very meagre character of the provision at present made for the Grammar Schools, remarked that, except the sum arising from fees, there was no revenue available for repairs, for fuel, or for the other expenses connected with the comfortable occupation of Grammar School premises. I had then added, 'But these fees are, except in a few schools, "of the most trifling character, and are annually becoming more distasteful, on account of the happily increasing number of FREE Common Schools," (p. 25). Will it be believed that my treacherous reviewer substitutes for the word "free," which contained the whole gist of the passage, the word "our;" and that then this Master of Artifice spends much the greater part of a column in ringing changes on the assertion falsely attributed to me, that the Grammar Schools are found to be practically superseded by the Common Schools. This disposes at once of about a third part of the *Telegraph's* article.

The title-page of the Pamphlet sets forth that Upper Canada College was established in defiance of the Legislature; and in the body of the Pamphlet it is, I trust, made sufficiently plain that Upper Canada College was established in defiance of the conditions precedent insisted on by the Legislature. Nevertheless, the reviewer finds some imaginary contradiction as regards this matter, between the title-page and the body of the statement.

Then comes a charge of forgery, to wit: "In quoting the Duke of Portland's Despatch of the 4th November, 1797, authorizing the appropriation of lands for support of Grammar Schools—we have this honest assailant of the College, deliberately substituting the word 'free' for the word 'four' in the passage where the Duke says that 'on the government grants four Grammar Schools were to constitute the first charge.' My reply is, that in the Duke of Portland's Despatch the word *four* does not once occur, but that on the contrary the following passage does occur: "He, [His Majesty George III.] has condescended to express His Most Gracious intention to comply with the wishes of the Legislature of his Province of Upper Canada in such manner as shall be judged most effectual: first by the establishment of *Free Grammar Schools* in the districts in which they are called for." I trust that our Legislators will, while within easy distance of the journals verify this quotation. It will be found in the journal of the Assembly for 1831, appendix page 105, (York: John Caye, 1831.)

The *Telegraph's* reviewer then declares that he finds it stated (falsely) in the Pamphlet, (p. 9), that the Governor referred in the opening speech of 1830, to the support of Upper Canada College. My reply is, that the reviewer finds in the Pamphlet no statement of the kind, but that he and every one else may find (on page 9), a statement to the effect that the Governor in a *Message* (sent down to the House on Feb. 4, 1830), suggested the maintenance of Upper Canada College by Parliament—which, as a matter of fact, he did.

My accuser charges that, in citing an Address of the House of Assembly in 1831, I have quoted the Address as containing the words "Grammar School Reserves." My reply is, that here, as in other places, my amiable reviewer generously supplies the quotation marks, and then charges that the manufactured quotation is not correct. The exact words of the Legislative Address are, that His Excellency "may be pleased to communicate to the House copies of all such documents as His Excellency may be in possession of, which authorize this survey, reservation, sale or appropriation of certain lands in this Province called School Townships;" (Journal of Assembly, 1831, Friday, Jan. 21). Now, does my reviewer on the one hand deny that the Grammar School Reserves are, by the language of the Legislature, intended; or does he, on the other hand, affirm that any school reservation other than that for Grammar Schools existed in this Province in 1831? If he does not deny the one, or affirm the other, wherein can I be justly accused of falsifying the records of Parliament, when I say in my Pamphlet, (p. 10), without professing to give an exact quotation from the Address, that "An Address was passed requesting His Excellency to lay before the House all documents relating to the Grammar School Reserves."

My accuser charges that in a quotation from an Address of the House in 1836, I have interpolated the word "secret." My reply is that

my reviewer here states what he must be fully aware is a malicious untruth. The quotation supplied in the Pamphlet, (p. 17), is strictly correct, and may be found on the journal of the House of Assembly, 1836, Wednesday, Jan. 20, p. 41, (Toronto: M. Reynolds, 1836.)

The next count in the indictment charges that I have attributed to the Legislature what was the mere individual opinion of Mr. Mackenzie regarding Upper Canada College. My reply is, that in this matter I have the honor to agree with the Imperial Government, and the misfortune to differ from my sagacious reviewer. In the Imperial Despatch appointing Sir F. B. Head, Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, dated Downing street, 5th December, 1835, and signed "Glenelg," the passage quoted in the Pamphlet, (p. 16), is given in full, and is mostly distinctly referred to by the Colonial Secretary as expressing the opinion of the House of Assembly of Upper Canada. In fact the question of the further maintenance of Upper Canada College occupies no inconsiderable part of the whole Despatch—an importance which it would be absurd to suppose that the Secretary for the Colonies would have attributed to the individual opinion of any man. This Despatch has been printed in the form of a small *duodecimo*, bearing the following title: "Message from His Excellency the Lieut. Gov., of the 30th Jan. 1836, transmitting a Despatch from Her Majesty's Government. Printed by Order of the Hon. the Legislative Council. R. Stanton, Printer." A copy will, no doubt, be found in the Parliamentary Library, where, I trust, it will be copiously consulted.

The charge, however, on which my reviewer lays most stress relates to the attendance of pupils at U. C. College. He says: "Again we are told that all the pupils that could be drummed up for the College in 1832, numbered only forty—these being the sons of persons enjoying 'government favors.'" Here, as elsewhere, the reviewer first falsifies the narrative, and then complains that it is false. In the first place the year 1830 and not 1832, is most distinctly referred to both in the context and notes. In the second place I state the number of pupils as nearly 90. The words of the Pamphlet are: "Sir John Colborne drummed up as recruits for his new regiment, the sons of all enjoying Government favors, or who might expect afterwards to do so, and then boasted to Parliament that the names of nearly 90 boys were on the Roll." (page 10) Then how, it will be asked, could this mendacious reviewer represent the passage as saying 40 pupils? The explanation is as simple as it is discreditable! He affects to misunderstand one of the very numerous note-references [40] for a integral part of the text, and he has then the effrontery to base on this falsification of his own conceiving, his crowning evidence of the falsity of my Pamphlet!

We have, doubtless, in this newspaper article the very cream of the U. C. College defence, which is announced as about to appear under the same auspices as that veracious epistle of Jan. 1868. After so remarkable an effusion, the public may very fairly have demanded of Toronto Editors, a little more caution in the acceptance of further statements from such a source—but a Toronto monopoly was to be sustained and under such circumstances the end is held to abundantly sanctify the means. On such a dastardly act as your journal has permitted, retribution is sure to follow, and so it may happen that your literary assassin, while intending murder, has really but committed suicide.

Dundas, Nov 6, 1868.

Yours truly,

J. HOWARD HUNTER.

RECENT ARTICLES in the "GLOBE" AND "LEADER".

On the fifth day of November,—rather an ill-omened day for conspirators against the welfare of the state!—articles on the U. C. College Question, simultaneously appeared in the *Globe* and *Leader*. The *Leader* especially dealt in "villanous salt-petre," and evidently, in the present conspiracy, divides with the *Telegraph* the exalted honor of carrying the dark lantern.

The article in the *Leader* of the 5th of November, is chiefly amusing as being the exact contradiction of an article on the same subject which appeared in the same journal, on Oct. 31. Under these circumstances I am content to wait until the *Leader* shall have settled this U. C. College question with his own troubled conscience, and given the world the benefit of his matured convictions. It would not be a profitable occupation of my time to reply to an article to which the *Leader* may itself, in all probability, on the morrow, supply the most ample and the most satisfactory confutation.

The *Globe* expresses its unqualified abhorrence of all such antiquarian researches as the U. C. College Pamphlet enters upon. And yet not many years ago the Constitutional Act of 1791, and the Clergy Reserves possessed inexhaustible attractions for our journalist. But when as in this instance the question concerns not the Clergy Reserves but the Grammar School Reserves—Ah! my friend, that is a different, because a Toronto, matter! It was not always so. If I were that unkind person that the *Globe* so feelingly portrays to its readers, I might wake once more to life, the echoes of former years,—echoes of manly utterances that have long since died away among the dusty volumes of that journal—I might astonish the Province with the ringing periods in which the *Globe* declaimed against this present monopoly. But all that is past, and the *Globe* loveth not antiquarian researches!

J. H. H.